# THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX MAY, 1956 No. 431

## Editorial

THE March issue of *Parish and People*[1] contained some useful articles on preaching, and also a communication from the clergy of St Anthony's, Newcastle-on-Tyne, in the course of which they make the following remarks that connect with what we said last month about the reading of the Bible in church in a version later than that of 1881:

> For a large majority of the congregation here, in this parish of very ordinary people, many of the Sunday epistles might as well still be read in Latin. These letters, written to very ordinary people in very ordinary language, we are ordered to read to very similar people in a language which they never hear or use outside Church and which has little or no connexion with their life. We wrap up the forceful words of the apostles and serve them up in a kind of "music" which is beautiful certainly, and which allows the simple (often simply aweful) truth to slide over us without requiring any response.
>
> We would like to question the necessity and the wisdom of this; we want permission to read a translation of the letters of the apostles which really is a translation into the language used and understood by the people to whom we are commissioned to minister the Word. We want permission to do it at the Eucharist. In fact we already do use such a translation whenever we can, at extra-liturgical services of all kinds. We read the epistles from J. B. Phillips' *Letters to Young Churches*. The effect is always remarkable. Questions like "Was that the Bible you were reading?" and remarks like "It got right home to me" . . . and "Made me sit up and take notice", these put side by side speak for themselves! The Diocesan Bishop cannot help us here. He is not able as things stand to give permission. The matter requires discussion, but surely the good common sense of the Church will see the wisdom of granting permission soon for use in our liturgy of some scholarly translation into the language of the people, not necessarily beautiful, but clear and to the point in the manner of the original writers.

A lay correspondent, who is a doctor in the South of England, independently writes to us to the same effect:

> We may lament the general ignorance of the populace concerning the basic facts of Christian history and revelation, but there is surely little encouragement to learn when the standard text-book is written in archaic English. To the average person—even perhaps the average intelligent person—the English of the Authorized Version is often both unintelligible and misleading, and there must be many who on reading Mr J. B. Phillips' *Letters to Young Churches* have felt the thrill of, in effect, reading these epistles for the first time. . . .
>
> Opponents of reform will often affirm that it would be vandalistic to abandon the incomparably beautiful English of the Authorized Version and that people should take the trouble to learn how to interpret it, but while it is true that the aesthetic loss is likely to be considerable, nevertheless if the language of the 17th century constitutes anything of an impediment to even the lowliest of God's children in their apprehension of his Word,

[1] 1s. 6d. from Lower Heyford Rectory, Oxford.

aesthetic considerations must surely be sacrificed. To put them first in these circumstances is idolatry and it is unthinkable that learning and refined tastes—excellent though they be in their place—should constitute a passport to the Scriptures.

We would call attention to the fact that *Letters to Young Churches* by J. B. Phillips has now been published by Messrs Collins in their Fontana Books at 2s. 6d.

* * * * *

We are glad to report two further additions to the "Library of Christian Classics".[1] The first part of *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa*, edited by Dr W. Telfer, contains selections from the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem. Most readers will find this edition the more interesting in that it is more fully annotated by the editor than has been the case with other volumes in this series. Better still, he has prefixed to Cyril's Lectures an introduction of nearly fifty pages in which, drawing on unfamiliar sources of learning, he gives a fascinating reconstruction of the circumstances of time, place and tradition in which the Lectures were delivered. Consequently, we have here a noteworthy contribution to church history as well as the publication of a text in translation. The same may be said of the second part of the volume which gives us the first English version, that has been made from the Greek, of Nemesius' "Of the Nature of Man". A translation was to have been included in the 19th-century Oxford "Library of the Fathers", but it never materialized. Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, is unknown except for what may be inferred from this treatise, which appears to have been written near the end of the fourth century and is no doubt correctly attributed to him. Dr Telfer thinks there is more to be said that has often been allowed for Tillemont's suggestion that Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, is the same person as the Nemesius who was governor of Cappadocia between 383 and 389, i.e. before his conversion and ordination. Nemesius may have begun his work "Of the Nature of Man" in his lay, or even in his pre-Christian, days, and subsequent experience may have led him to change its character. "He set out to write an anthropology," says Dr Telfer. "He ended with a polemic against fatalism, and a defence of the Christian doctrine of divine providence. In this way we may see the effect of pastoral experience in a Syrian city, where fatalism was the perennial foe." It is a work that, because of its liberal spirit and expression of ancient scientific ideas, may make a wider appeal to modern readers than many patristic writings.

About three thousand of Luther's letters have survived. The admirable selection from them made in *Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, edited and translated by Dr T. G. Tappert, illustrates his pastoral care for those who depended on him for advice and encouragement. They are classified under such headings as "Comfort for the Sick and Dying", "Cheer for the Anxious and Despondent", "Advice in Time of Epidemic and Famine", "Suggestions for Prob-

[1] S.C.M. Press, 30s. each.

lems Facing Clergymen", "Exhortations concerning Rulers and the State". Each letter is prefixed by a note explaining the circumstances in which it was written. Some extracts from Luther's table-talk on related themes are also included. Sides of his character are here revealed that are not widely known to English readers. Many of the letters have not been translated before, and those that have been, not previously so fully or so accurately.

* * * * *

Anyone with only an elementary knowledge of German, who attempts to read theological books in that language, is liable to find that ordinary dictionaries do not supply so much help as could be desired. *A Theological German Vocabulary*, by Walter M. Mosse,[1] which gives the English translation not only of technical theological expressions but also of words that are frequently used in a theological context, will prove to be an invaluable *vade mecum*. In many cases the meaning of a word is illustrated by a quotation from the Bible (R.S.V.). Synonyms are also noted. Mr Mosse is Tutor in Theological German at Princeton Theological Seminary.

* * * * *

Books on the Christian doctrine of man can be dull and ponderous. In fact, there are few good books on the subject, and it is a subject that offers to-day one the most promising points of contact with thoughtful non-Christians. *Man in the Midst*, by John Taylor,[2] is a short book (80 pages), but quite first-class. Mr Taylor knows how to write; he has a happy gift of drawing on illustrations from his experience in England and Africa; and he says what most needs to be said. It is a book that should be in parish libraries, and available for lending to inquirers far and wide. And the clergy too will find that it has things to say to them; for example: "Possibly one of the most practical and creative disciplines that any incumbent could enter upon these days would be quietly to sit down and imagine how he would do his task in the parish with no church buildings whatsoever and a ban on all meetings of more than a dozen people. Then when he had solemnly drawn up his plans for such a situation, he should put the greater part of them into effect now in spite of the fact that he still has his church and his normal gathering of the whole congregation."

* * * * *

The teaching and practice of the Church of Scotland with regard to marriage are often referred to in England but it is not easy to be sure exactly what they have been and are. We are grateful to Professor Tindal for complying with our request for an informative article on the subject.

* * * * *

Subscribers to THEOLOGY, who do not wish to retain their copies,

[1] Macmillan (New York and London), 17s. 6d. [2] Highway Press, 6s.

do a good service if they undertake to forward them after perusal to a missionary overseas. Miss C. Peterken (21 Bethune Road, London, N. 16), who organizes on behalf of S.P.G. the sending of periodicals abroad, will be glad to receive offers from any of our subscribers. She has at present a long list of would-be recipients of THEOLOGY.

---

## The Indispensability of Q

IN THEOLOGY for August 1955 Q was said to be "under fire", with reference in particular to Dr Austin Farrer's essay "On Dispensing with Q" in the volume *Studies in the Gospels* edited by Prof. Nineham. It is surely worth considering whether the attack is as serious as appears to be thought. In the opinion of the present writer Dr Farrer's alternative view, that Luke had read Matthew, is impossible.

To question the existence of what has become definitely accepted as a new star in the Synoptic firmament is a bold venture. Its existence is accepted by the vast majority of scholars outside the Roman Church. That communion does not allow her scholars to believe in Q, but neither does it accept the priority of Mark which Dr Farrer does. But the priority of Mark and Q are twin hypotheses which mutually support each other. We find Matthew and Luke resembling each other in terms of a document which we do possess. We also find them resembling each other in another set of passages, presumably a source which is lost. The existence of a common source is inherently probable and not a needless complication as Dr Farrer thinks. It has failed to survive because it was entirely embodied in the fuller gospels, a fate which nearly befell Mark also. Because of this misfortune it must remain a hypothesis, and Dr Farrer dislikes hypotheses. But it is a very probable hypothesis. That Luke used Matthew is also a hypothesis, and we venture to think a very improbable one.

What is wrong with Q? Dr Farrer tells us that since Streeter's time our whole approach to the gospels has changed. But is the situation so very different? We now lay more stress on the oral stage before documents were penned. We may feel less certain about the boundaries of the special sources of Matthew and Luke, perhaps even regarding them not as documents at all but as "the evangelists' own store", to quote Dr Farrer. Many hold that Q may have existed in different forms, developing variously in Antioch, Caesarea and Rome perhaps. Different versions of Q, according to the late W. L. Knox (*Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, I, xii), would explain the difficulties in the parallel woes on the Scribes and Pharisees. There is a swing away from a multiplication of purely literary sources, supposed to have been dove-tailed together by editors of the scissors-and-paste variety, to a view which sees in the evangelists genuine authors. But there is still general agreement that at least two written documents, Mark and Q, underlay Matthew and Luke.

Dr Farrer thinks Luke had read Matthew. Apart from the dating—Matthew is usually held to be nearer the end of the first century than

Luke—could Luke really have left out so much of Matthew because it did not attract him? Could he really have broken up the well-arranged Matthaean discourses to put the fragments in settings that are usually inferior? It has been proved by Sir John Hawkins that there is not a single case after the story of the Temptation in which Luke agrees with Matthew in inserting the same saying at the same point in the Marcan outline. Now could Luke really have been so wilful as to alter all the contexts of these non-Marcan insertions in the Marcan settings found for them by Matthew? Further, is it not certain that Luke's version is at least sometimes more original than Matthew's, from which he is supposed to have derived it? Indeed, if we had to dispense with Q, the reverse thesis, to argue that Matthew had read Luke, would be simpler. We should then use all the arguments given in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* for the originality of the Lucan order of Q as opposed to the Matthaean. It is much easier to find reason why Matthew altered Luke than vice versa, for Matthew is always conflating and editing in any case—he does it with Mark.

We do not, however, propose to suggest anything of the sort, for we are convinced that neither evangelist used the other, but both drew on a common source. The original order of this is probably usually given by Luke. The actual wording of it is sometimes more original in the one and sometimes in the other. Some cases are indecisive; thus Dr Farrer argues that "If I by the *finger* of God cast out devils" in Luke is less primitive than "the spirit" in Matthew. (Luke's Bible learning introduced the reference to Deut. 9. 10 or Exod. 8. 19.) But it is just as likely that Matthew altered it as being anthropomorphic. There are other cases, however, in which Luke is definitely more original—e.g. the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer. The antithetic Beatitudes and Woes in Luke are surely more primitive than the highly composite nine Beatitudes in Matthew. The Lord's Prayer contains three clauses in Matthew which are wanting in Luke, and they are in the first evangelist's idiom. Surely he is the one who has done the editing. Such is the opinion of Dr G. D. Kilpatrick in his recent exhaustive study. But Dr Farrer is obliged to suppose that Luke deliberately shortened Matthew's version of our Lord's own prayer.

It is important to notice what is at stake here. On the Q hypothesis we are not forced to assert that either of the evangelists always gives the original version. On the contrary, it is only to be expected that sometimes one and sometimes the other gives the original, for both are drawing from the same source and making slight modifications. But for Dr Farrer's thesis to be true, *every single verse* in Matthew must be more original than its counterpart in Luke, for Luke has taken it from Matthew.

"We cannot say that the Q sections of St Matthew's Gospel have a strong distinctive flavour, marking them off from the rest of his writing." True, to a large extent Matthew has imposed his own style over the whole. But there is a Judaistic tendency in part of his non-Marcan matter which justifies us in setting *that* apart. "Will it not

do to say that St Luke let alone what he did not care for, viz., the rabbinic parts of Matthew?" Conceivably, if on other grounds we could prove that he followed Matthew, which is just what we cannot prove.

Then Dr Farrer produces his trump card. What about the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark? Is it not special pleading on Streeter's part to explain them all away, when they naturally point to the obvious conclusion which Streeter kept running away from, that Luke was acquainted with Matthew, and "small Matthaean echoes keep reappearing"? But these agreements have nothing to do with Q. The reason why Streeter explained them away was because they affected the question of the priority of Mark in its present form. He had already established the existence of Q on major grounds, and had definitely disproved the use of either's gospel by the other writer. The minor agreements must therefore be due either to textual assimilation or independent alteration, or conflation with a parallel source. To suggest, as Dr Farrer does, that the skilful advocate deliberately closed his eyes to the one obvious solution, is most misleading. Admittedly, if these agreements were all to be allowed so much weight, they would provide some small support to the view that Luke had read Matthew, if that could be otherwise proved. (They would equally support the view that Matthew had read Luke, of course.)

But it is to be feared that Dr Farrer has not done Streeter the compliment of re-reading him recently, for on p. 79 he argues that the Lucan position and wording of the Great Commandment (10. 25–28) is a deliberate re-arrangement, in the interests of typology, of Matthew's version. Dr Farrer then continues "Streeter's plea to the contrary (i.e. that the Marcan and not the Matthaean version is Luke's model) is a necessity forced upon him by his general position". Streeter, however (*Four Gospels*, p. 320), does *not* say that Luke is following Mark, but admits that he has far more in common with Matthew. In fact, of course, he regards this as one of the Lucan substitutions of parallel non-Marcan episodes in a different context, similar to the Anointing, Rejection at Nazareth, etc. He really agrees with Dr Farrer that it is a re-arrangement by Luke, only of Q material, not of Matthew.

A great deal is said by Dr Farrer about the impossibility of such a document as Q containing no account of the Death of Christ. Could a document, he asks, which started with an "exordium so full of dogmatic weight" peter out in miscellaneous oracles? We cannot see why it should not have been a rudimentary or incomplete account of Christ's teaching and ministry with special reference to his relation to his predecessor. The purpose of St Mark would then be to supplement this torso by furnishing an adequate account of the ministry and death, whilst omitting altogether, or repeating very concisely, matters already contained in Q.

Dr Farrer next proceeds to list five arguments against his theory and attempts to answer them.

(i) Some texts in Matthew would not have been omitted by Luke

had he known them. We will agree with Dr Farrer that decisive weight cannot be placed on this sort of argument.

(ii) Luke's wording of some of the sayings is more primitive. This Dr Farrer questions, preferring Harnack's version to Streeter's. But there is simply no doubt, *pace* Dr Farrer, that Matthew has added "in spirit" to Luke's "poor", and "after righteousness" to his "hunger (and thirst)", consistently with his general attitude that there is a right use of wealth. Matthew's version is sometimes more original, but to prove that it is always so is an impossible task. Yet it must be proved for Dr Farrer's thesis to succeed. The Q defenders are content if sometimes one and sometimes the other appears more original.

(iii) On this supposition Luke would have used Matthew's gospel differently from the way he uses Mark's, not embodying long stretches of it but dividing it into small pieces. Synoptic criticism *per contra* has asserted it as a cardinal principle that Matthew and Luke would each deal with their second authority in the same way that they dealt with their first. The principle seems reasonable. Why should it be more difficult to follow two sources with equal regularity than one when you embody them in strips? The usual view yields a clear result: Matthew treats Mark freely and similarly chops up and conflates Q. Luke on the other hand hardly makes any alterations to the Marcan order, and we should certainly expect *a priori* that he would normally preserve the order of his other main source.

(iv) But this leads on to a worse difficulty: the order and connexions in the common material are admittedly often less appropriate in Luke than in Matthew. Dr Farrer has to admit that we must accuse Luke of pulling well-ordered Matthaean discourses to pieces. But he holds there is method in Luke's madness. An attempt is made to prove that in the central section there is evidence of Luke's achieving very successful rearrangements by his alterations of the Matthaean order. He divides up Matthew's long sermons because "they run so long that we lose sight of the narrative", and places them in his central section, enlivening them with episodes. We believe that Luke did indeed do something of this sort, only by combining Q with his own material; and we challenge Dr Farrer to produce a single example which clearly proves that Luke must have been working on Matthew, not merely Q.

An instance given of Luke's supposed method is his conjunction of the Paternoster with the section "ask and it shall be given you". We are told that Luke has read the Sermon on the Mount; he notes the two sections on prayer disjoined by a couple of pages. So he joins them together, omitting Matthew's comment, "For if you forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you", etc. That would have concentrated attention on the phrase "forgive us our trespasses", whereas Luke wants to direct attention to "Give us this day to-morrow's *bread*"—he is going on in the "Ask" section to say, "What man is there of you of whom his son shall ask *bread* and he will give him a stone?" Now we do not deny that Luke has made a very successful combination here, only we think he made it from

Q and his own material, not from Matthew. He did not have to omit "for if ye forgive", etc., for that was never in Q, but is added by Matthew. We can perfectly understand what Matthew has done in separating sections which stood together: he was interested in bringing in fasting and prayer alongside of almsgiving.

Again, Dr Farrer argues that after the Beelzebub controversy Luke gives "Blessed is the womb which bare thee", etc., because in Matthew the parallel Marcan incident of the visit of Jesus' relations follows there. He would not have put the episode here had not Matthew supplied the clue. It is just as easy to argue that "Blessed is the womb", etc., stood here in Q, and Matthew substituted the parallel Marcan incident. There is not a single instance in which Dr Farrer can produce *definite* knowledge by Luke of Matthew, and he knows it, for he writes presently, "He links the new episode and the old in a peculiar way which clearly betrays dependence on St Matthew, or (if you will have it so) on a Q which was virtually identical with St Matthew for a couple of pages".

We fail to see why the joining of the two parables of the Strong Man Armed and the Unclean Spirit returning to his House betrays a perception of the relation between two Matthaean parables. Matthew has doubtless disjoined the two Q parables: the section on demons should include the second parable as in Luke. But Matthew wishes to speak of the whole nation relapsing spiritually instead of an individual as in Q. He therefore brings forward the Sign of Jonah which in Q followed the Unclean Spirit, so that he can arraign the whole nation for their spiritual blindness to one greater than Jonah or Solomon. The whole evil generation is now possessed by seven devils worse than the first. This he makes clear by an editorial comment in 12. 45, "even so shall it be also unto this evil generation". Luke 11. 16 is merely an editorial link.

(v) The last argument which Dr Farrer cites and attempts to demolish is the most weighty of all. We have already touched on it: "it is alleged by those who deny the credibility of St Luke's having used St Matthew, that he never places Matthaean material (in their language Q material) in the Marcan place which St Matthew assigns it." This argument concerns not the floating passages of Q, about whose relative order and wording one guess might be as good as another (although we do not think so), but the Matthaean insertions in the Marcan framework. Luke never agrees in inserting them in the same place where Matthew elects to put them. Is it not incredible, as Hawkins asked, that if Luke had besides Mark a complete Matthew he would have almost entirely ignored his placing of these additions during so large a part of his own work? We wonder if Sir John's New Testament is still extant in which he showed in the left-hand margin of Mark the exact point in which Matthew had inserted most of the common sayings with chapter and verse, and in the right-hand margin the point where Luke had done so. After the story of the Temptation *there is not a single case where they coincide.* Now is this not curious? If Luke had all Matthew as well as Mark before him he must have collated the two—made a sort of rudimentary

synopsis, and whenever Matthew added a saying to Mark he must have taken it out and deliberately put it somewhere else, although Matthew's contexts were always most appropriate. As Dr Farrer puts it, "we should have to explain why Luke disencumbers the Marcan narrative of St Matthew's additions to it and puts them by themselves". It is true, as he says, that he does not put them in other Marcan contexts, but neither should we have expected that on the usual view of the composition of the Third Gospel, for Luke keeps Mark in blocks.

How does Dr Farrer meet this difficulty? He says that in Matthew 3–13 the evangelist so skips up and down in Mark's order that Luke would have been too bewildered to be able to follow him. Still we are entitled to be mildly surprised when he takes the verse "Many shall come from the east and the west and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" out of Matthew's Centurion's Servant, where it comes with magnificent effect, teaching that universalism so dear to his own heart, and transfers it to a vague eschatological context in 13. 28–30. In his parable chapter 13, Matthew can quite easily be compared with Mark, yet we are to suppose that for some reason Luke has taken out the Blessing on the Eyes and Ears of the Disciples, which Matthew connects with their understanding of the parables, and attaches it instead to the cry "I think thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth" given two chapters earlier by Matthew. It may be added that Luke's version of the Blessing on the Disciples is certainly more primitive than Matthew's, for Matthew adds the ears to the eyes to correspond with an Old Testament quotation that he has introduced. Is it not far preferable to suppose that Luke is working on Q direct and Matthew has created this composite chapter from Mark, Q, and his own material?

From 14 onwards Matthew treads closely in Mark's footsteps, and Luke could easily have followed him. There will be greater difficulty than ever about the Great Omission by Luke of Mark 6. 45–8. 26. It certainly cannot now be due to accidental omission in Mark's text, for it could not very well have been missing in exactly the same place in Matthew's. But let that pass. At the healing of the Epileptic Boy Luke holds over Matthew's saying about a grain of mustard seed till a later and less appropriate occasion offers itself (17. 6). But the difficulties increase when Luke lays aside Mark at 9. 40 and embarks on his central section, for in these chapters are many anticipations from the Matthaean chapters that he has "not yet skimmed of their Marcan elements". He cannot now be remembering bits of Matthew not in Mark and holding them over to fill up his big central section; he must, on Dr Farrer's view, have laid down his own MSS, collated Matthew 19–25 with Mark 9–13, extracted various non-Marcan passages from Matthew and inserted them at different points. Now is this a probable procedure? Let us take the Woes on the Scribes and Pharisees. Luke is going to follow Mark 12. 38–40 when he gets to it, but we are now asked to believe that he compares Matthew's 39 verses with Mark's 3, leaves out a number of rabbinical sayings not

to his liking, and copies the remaining Matthaean verses in the following order. Matt. 23. 25–6, 23, 6–7, 27, 4, 29–31, 34–36, 13. He then postpones our Lord's Lament over Jerusalem for two chapters although Matthew has given it a marvellously impressive context. He further alters Matthew's sevenfold division to a threefold one, although we know that Matthew had a penchant for arranging things in sevens. Is it not, once more, far preferable to believe that it is Matthew who is here adapting a variant form of Q, conflating it with his own material, and putting the whole in a Marcan setting?

Finally, we may observe that certain parables which differ so greatly that some have doubted whether they are in Q at all make it wellnigh impossible to believe that Luke has read Matthew's version. The Marriage Feast or Great Supper, and the Talents or Pounds, are much grander affairs in Matthew than Luke. If there is any direct indebtedness, it is obvious on which side the debt lies.

It is as certain as anything can be that Luke has not derived his versions from Matthew. Surely the verdict on all this must be that this *tour de force* has failed, leaving the main results of generations of patient scholars unimpaired.

W. H. Blyth Martin.

---

## What is Marriage?

"An ontological relationship, of which the basis is love"; a contract, terminable by the consent of both parties; a status; an indissoluble bond; part of the institution of the family; a natural sacrament; and, of Christian marriage, a principle, an ideal, one of the seven sacraments . . . so the answers pour out, and the resulting confusion of proposals and remedies is due to the failure to agree upon the answer to this question.

To find it, Christians must begin with our Lord's own words. If we observe the distinction he makes, it will save us from adding to the confusion. "From the beginning", "For the hardness of your hearts", "I say unto you".

We begin with the state of man innocent, within the divine *Kosmos, ordnung* or *sava* (Gen. 1. 2). This notion, which is fundamental to Biblical thought and Christian theology, is different from the enactment of a lawgiver, who has to temper his demands to the capacities of the governed. Rather it is the pattern in the mind of the creative artist. *Kosmos* has the secondary meaning of "adornment" as of a bride. In this order, man and woman are in perfect relationship with God and with each other. They are under the control of the Holy Spirit, "who sweetly ordereth all things" and who is the bond of love that unites them. In their union "in one flesh", *sarx-soma*, or *Whole Person* (see Best, *One Body in Christ*, pp. 77 ff.), they are the *imago dei*, they re-present the very being of God. What this is comes to us from the fulness of God's revelation of himself. He is the unity of Persons, whose coinherence is the operation of the

Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father to the Son and through the Son to his creation.

Wherever and whenever man enters into true relationship with other men according to the divine *Kosmos,* person with person, the purpose of creation is fulfilled. God reproduces himself in his creatures. The end of man is the communion of saints. Within this, marriage has a unique position, or function. For in the union of man and woman, there is a degree of union which is peculiar to marriage, because man is, in his whole person, body, as well as mind and spirit. In this way we arrive at the purpose of marriage in the divine order; and we also see that it is as much the creative act of God to divide as it is to unite. In our right passion for union in the chaotic and divided world in which we live, we do well to remember this. It has often been the manner of the division which has been sinful, and not the division, without which a growth in charity and knowledge would not have been possible. There is a true dialectic, not necessarily in the successiveness of time, but in the eternal activity of love. Many a marriage might have been saved from disaster if it had been more clearly taught that the drawing apart of husband and wife need not necessarily be due to the fault of one or other, or both. It might quite simply be due to the rhythm of love, in which we have to find and rediscover our real selves at ever-deeper levels, in order to give ourselves more fully.

As marriage has this unique function in the divine order, so the manner of the expression of the bond between man and wife is restricted to marriage. The act of coitus means "I give myself to you that we may become one in love", and Christ's words clearly reveal that this is a relationship between two persons and none other. We are not here concerned with questions that arise from the coming of sin and death. In the state of man's innocency marriage was a personal relationship, effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit, evoking spontaneous union in whole personalities. It was not an institution, because it was not dependent on compulsion from without. Those who speak of "free love" bear witness to the racial memory of *what should be;* their mistake is that they try to achieve it in disregard of the purification which man's fallenness lays upon him. The City has its place and demands in the divine order and they cannot be flouted in the name of Love. Such contradiction is blasphemy.

So we come to the second state of man, "the hardness of your hearts" . . . man fallen. We are not concerned here with the act of disobedience, but its effect. Whether we are guided by the hebraic myth of the garden, or the Christian myth of the son leaving home, the essential fact is, to borrow the countryman's penetrating phrase, "man got wrong with God". Being in wrong relationship with him, he was no longer under the control of the Holy Spirit. He was not moved spontaneously to obey the divine order. His heart was hardened. He was insensitive to God's demands.

But he was not totally corrupt. He was outside the control of the Holy Spirit, but not outside his operation. Man still fell in love

with woman and lived a true married life, as the story of Jacob and Rachel reminds us. The operation of the Holy Spirit, however, was not confined to his evocation of love. As God's grace and mercy were upon man in right relationship and obedience to his *Kosmos*, so his wrath, or antagonism, was against all that contradicted this order. Man feared the effect of this *orge*, pain and death. He maintained such order, such resemblance of the *Kosmos* as he saw and could accomplish, by appeal to this fear in others. This is the foundation of the tribal life and the State, and all their institutional life. However we interpret "the powers that be" that are ordained of God, whether they be earthly or heavenly, it remains true that, in so far as they are fulfilling their true function, rulers are ministers of God's wrath upon the disobedient. Their function is in the last resort compulsion, and their sanction is fear. In this way God has not abandoned fallen man to chaos, but maintains such order as is within fallen man's capacity.

Marriage, in this order, is an institution, or rather part of the institution, of the family. That is why the anthropologist, whose study is fallen humanity, reverses the divine order and interprets marriage in terms of family, instead of Christ's primary reference to the union of man and wife to whom the command is given "be fruitful and multiply". This reversal of sequence may lead to profound errors of judgment, if it is not recognized. But such recognition is more apparent to-day, when it is being seen that the right adjustments in family life depend largely upon the right relationship between parents.

For the Ruler, however, marriage and family are an institution, which must be controlled by laws for the good order of society as a whole and the continuance of the race, which includes the upbringing of children. Laws are bad when they are directed to an order of society which is lower than that within the capacity of its members generally. But they are equally bad when they are so much above them that they are broken to such an extent that law itself is brought into contempt. Rulers have to bear both considerations in mind when framing their marriage laws; and the exercise of such wisdom is as much the operation of the Holy Spirit, in his ordering of all things, as is his effecting of those true marriage relationships to which pagan and legendary stories bear their witness. Even the institution of polygamy, while having its economic benefits, can also be a true act of charity to the unprotected females of a tribe. We have to face the question, "Was Moses, when he gave Israel divorce for the hardness of their hearts, God's lawgiver?" We have no warrant for denying it. What are God's demands upon fallen man, in this matter of marriage, in particular? The phrase "natural law" can be misleading. Its meaning depends upon the "nature" concerned. What God demanded of Man Innocent need not be assumed to be his demand upon Man Fallen. The Fathers found it difficult to account for the polygamy of the Patriarchs, apparently sanctioned in the Scriptures. They introduced the notion of a "special dispensation from the natural law" for the multiplication of the People of

God. The difficulty disappears if we accept the full implications of Christ's reference to the divine provision "for the hardness of man's heart".

But such acceptance is tolerable only if we go on to the further acceptance of God's way of dealing with man fallen in order to restore in him the divine *Kosmos*—the Way of Redemption. To understand this we have to consider the effect of the fall upon human nature in itself within each individual person, and in men in their relationship with each other, particularly between man and woman. Within himself man's nature became disordered. He had been given the command, "have dominion over the animal", and no longer was he able to control the animal within him according to the divine *Kosmos*.

If we could point out to the younger generation that the action of the scientist in establishing dominion over Creation is one with their struggle to control their "natural appetites" and is a response to the divine edict "have dominion", it would help them to find an incentive and harmony in their lives which at present may be lacking. But it is the inordinateness of the affections and the evilness of the concupiscence in so far as they contradict the *Kosmos* that have to be stressed, and no suggestion must be made that it is the affections or the concupiscence that are in themselves evil.

Their evil springs from the effect of the fall upon man in relation to others. He has withdrawn into himself, making his own desires, honour and comfort the centre of his concern. The Holy Spirit still operates within fallen humanity and we must recognize this operation when we see it. But the other side of the picture is so dark that it needs no painting here. It would appear that it becomes darker the further man achieves responsibility for his own actions and is not simply subject to the fear of law and its penalties. There is a "sex antagonism", a desire to dominate and possess inordinately, a refusal to give oneself away and accept the responsibilities and humiliations which the growing into one of two sinful selves requires. In a word, the bond of love is not "natural" to fallen humanity, and civilized man may be more profoundly fallen than primitive.

We can be saved from confusion of thought and wasted argument if here we observe the distinction to which Fr D'Arcy has drawn attention in *The Mind and Heart of Love. Agape, eros,* and we would add *philia,* are not in themselves better or worse than one another, they are not higher or lower. They all concern the whole being of man, the whole of his nature. They are all parts, or ingredients, of "love" in its fulness. But they have been corrupted by the fall and so seek to find expression in ways contrary to the divine purpose. Thus *eros,* which can be desire to possess God and be possessed by him, can also be desire for self-destruction.

Such is the state of man fallen, in the hardness of his heart, for which the Redeeming Act of God was and is the remedy.

The Act of Redemption began with the call of Abraham and the establishment of the covenant relationship between God and his people. The call is an epitome of every true lovers' meeting. There

is the vision, the inner compulsion, the faith that packs up and leaves home, the hope that journeys. That is love's way. But the redeeming act was in the establishing of the covenant. There seems to be no exhaustive study in the English language of this key-word of key-words. It is frequently used by theologians but its meaning is assumed rather than sought. Yet no word is so central in both Sacramental and Biblical thought. Dr Dillistone devotes some attention to it in *The Structure of the Divine Society*, but he would be the first to admit the inadequacy of the treatment.

With so little guidance, may we suggest that the root notion in this covenant relationship is God's assurance to man of right relationship? It is the assurance of God's peace. No longer is man "wrong with God". The assurance is not perfect, nor is the relationship perfectly restored. Sin, especially sin with the high hand, has not yet been dealt with. It looks forward to this day of salvation. Meanwhile, to use Charles Williams' penetrating phrase, "God has shut up sin into oblivion."

On man's side there is the law to be observed. But while this partly has the character of other tribal law and is enforced by pain and death (the adulteress is stoned), for Israel is a "natural tribe", yet *Torah* is also more than legal enactment. God's appeal is to man's gratitude for the favour and mercy of God assured in the covenant. The keeping of the law is both the expression of this gratitude and the condition of the assurance. The demands of the law are tempered to man's capacity, which is limited by the fact that sin has not yet been dealt with, and so the full revelation of God's love has not yet been made and its effect upon man not yet released.

Meanwhile, the People of God are constantly recalled to the keeping of the law by both prophet and priest, and the appeal is always to God's faithfulnes to his covenant. In this faithfulness is seen the nature of God in action in the face of unfaithfulness. This relationship is seen by Hosea and Jeremiah in terms of the marriage relationship, and the theme of Israel as Yahweh's wife constantly recurs throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. God's righteousness is vindicated supremely in his faithfulness to his covenant when Israel is unfaithful.

In the fulness of time Christ was born under the law. His work was to deal with sin. He conquered, he paid the price, he reconciled, he gave himself for us—in whatever terms we state it, the result was that he brought to man God's perfect peace. Those who accepted in faith what he had done were at peace with God. The barrier had been broken down; and in this breaking man was at one also with his fellow-believers. To-day's experience is the same. When two have knelt together at the foot of the Cross and received their pardon from the lips of the Crucified, they rise at one in a common gratitude for a common forgiveness. This is not only true of the reconciliations of husbands and wives who have become estranged, but it has been the often unrecognized secret of all Christian marriages. We forgive, as we are forgiven.

In this way marriage is redeemed. It has been made possible for

men and women to be at one at the deepest level, not ignoring sin or tolerating it, in themselves or in the other; but being purified from it, little by little, as they seek to respond to the demands of love, in their relationship with each other. In this way, the Holy Spirit increasingly controls their behaviour, and their mutual love is more and more completely his operation, as they grow in dependence on him.

This is true of Christian marriage, not only where the response has been the conscious effort of both parties, but also to a greater or less degree, wherever the Gospel of God's pardon has influenced the behaviour of men and women. Religion, however formal, has its fruits, as we realize only too well, when we attempt the reconciliation of those who have no contact with it whatsoever. They cannot say, "I am sorry".

Christian marriage, then, startled the pagan world, not because Christ had enunciated new principles or ideals, but because he had released a new operation of the Holy Spirit. Men and women found themselves wanting to go love's way and all the way, for they had found that this is what love means. "He loved me and gave himself for me"; even so, says St Paul, a man should love his wife. Christian marriage is a *mysterion* in which the nature of God, Persons at one in Love, and his relationship to man, as Lover and beloved, are partially revealed. It is a *covenant relationship,* in which man is called to reproduce the faithfulness of God, which is Love's way in the face of not-love.

It is doubtful whether the experiences we term "falling in love" and "romantic love" were the new thing which some writers tell us emerged amongst the troubadours. The stories of Jacob—and may we add David?—are echoed from such an unexpected quarter as a student of primitive African marriage. Arranged marriages have not always been what they might appear. But whether Christians enter into marriage with an inner conviction which finds its expression in the words, "We feel we are meant for each other"; with a vision, however dim, of the Love that demands all and gives all; and with a call to pack up and seek a blessing in an unknown country: or whether it is a response to a situation contrived by others—in every case it is a vocation, a call to become one with Love, to seek God for himself and do his will in and through that particular situation. Fidelity is not conditioned by the behaviour of another, but is part of this vocation. It is the *esse,* not the *bene* or even *plene esse,* of love.

But to be faithful in a world corrupted by sin involves *martyrdom,* the bearing witness to the truth in and through suffering. The Orthodox rite reminds us that marriage is a martyrdom. Entire self-giving is a death and resurrection. The glory of celibacy is the offering of its incompleteness. So when the Church calls one whose partner has been faithless to the martyrdom of fidelity, she is only fulfilling the mission on which she was sent and from which too often she shrinks back.

This duty of bearing witness to the truth must govern all the Church's activities in this matter of marriage. First, she needs to

take these truths to those who are puzzled. The response is remarkable when they are presented in popular language, however inadequately. Theology comes to life when it touches such vital concerns. As the clergy study to do this work they will find that it throws fresh light upon their faith. Revelation of person to person needs the word "I love you" to be incarnated in the action of flesh and blood to be complete. "Knowing" is only thus fully understood. Would the faith (*pistis*), which justifies, be more properly translated "faithfulness", including self-committal and fidelity? Such insights, gained from the marriage relationships, might enrich apologetics and resolve theological deadlocks.

Fresh light also will be shed on the interior life of clergy and laity alike. Retreat conductors need to be as familiar with the purgations, illuminations, darknesses and aridities of the integrated units of husband and wife as they are with those of individual souls.

To name marriage as sacrament is to focus attention too much upon the rite in which it is covenanted. The total relationship is sacramental. The exchange of vows and bestowal of God's blessing should be restored to its rightful place within the Gospel Sacrament, where the true meaning of marriage is most clearly seen. It re-presents the mystical union betwixt Christ and his Church and each true act within it is Holy Communion.

In the discipline of her members the Church has to keep in mind the need of clear witness to the *mysterion* of marriage and its demands; but she must also remember that her witness is to Love and Love's ways. She must not imitate ways proper to the *imperium* of the State.

In confronting the State she must demand that nothing in its laws should obscure her witness nor confuse the minds of those who take her marriage vows. At the same time she must recognize the hardness of the hearts of those who do not share her faith; and not ask of them more than God himself has done. She should encourage laws that make for the stability of family life. Reconciliation should be made more evidently, not only the concern, but also the interest, of all those engaged in the law; and the Church should be training her members to do their part in this work with the special insights which their faith gives them. It should not be left to a society, however admirable, that has no credal basis.

But if these activities are to be fruitful one thing is needful. "Look well!" Love grows in contemplation and not without it.

E. P. Field.

---

## Marriage and Divorce in the Church of Scotland

In an Anglican standard work, entitled *Marriage in Church and State*, it is asserted that at the Reformation "all communities of the Reformed went back from the Christian tradition as completely as the Lutheran to make of divorce a dissolution of marriage". "The Reformers," it continues, "addressed themselves *urbi et orbi*. Their

law of marriage passed intact into Scotland where it still stands, apparently unassailable."[1] We may ask, then, what happened in Scotland at the Reformation, and what it is that stands unassailable.

## The Consistorial Courts

It was common ground in medieval Scotland, as elsewhere, that the Roman Canon Law, as it had been administered, had woefully failed to protect the marriage state, and the Reformers modified the Canon Law and abolished the Roman ecclesiastical courts as soon as they were in a position to do so. There had been official courts of bishops in Scotland from which there was right of appeal to an Appellate Court in Rome, but there had been bitter complaint over the expense, uncertainty and corruption in their administration, and on 24 August 1560 an Act of the Convention of the Estates (the Scottish Parliament) was passed, abolishing the authority of the Pope and all popish jurisdiction within the realm.

At once, owing to the pressure of litigants, some substitute for the papal courts had to be found. Lord Fraser, in his *Treatise on Husband and Wife*, says that "the Court of Session, as the Crown's supreme Court, stood intact. To that tribunal therefore were consistorial cases now carried."[2] But the Court of Session was not the sole court. Kirk Sessions constituted themselves into Consistorial Courts in Edinburgh, Glasgow and St Andrews. St Andrews assumed the name of "the Consistorial Court of the ministers and elders of the said city". To these kirk sessions the Privy Council remitted applications for divorce, and in one of them in 1561 the kirk session refused to recognize the validity of the sentence of divorce pronounced by one of the papal officials because he did it in a private house "long after the said city was reformed by sincere preaching and hearing of God's true word; all public idolatry, papistry, and papistical jurisdiction abolished furth of the same; the consistory house discharged and stekyt up".[3]

In 1563, however, something in the nature of the old ecclesiastical court was re-established by Queen Mary. Four "trusty counsellors and well-beloved clerks" were appointed to the office of Commissaries, and on the same day the Queen issued the charter of constitution of the commissariat.

The judges were authorized to determine all causes formerly competent in the courts of the Roman officials, but with jurisdiction over all Scotland in cases of marriage, divorce and bastardy. The Legislature by an Act of 1592 ratified and confirmed the institution of the Court and the Court of Session was authorized to select the judges. At the restoration of episcopacy, bishops were appointed as Consistorial judges by an Act of 1609, and bishops exercised their power (with the interruption of the Protectorate of Cromwell) onward to the Revolution when, by the abolition of Episcopacy, the right of nomination was again returned to the Crown by whom it was exer-

[1] Lacey and Mortimer, *Marriage in Church and State*, p. 151.
[2] Patrick Fraser, *Treatise on Husband and Wife according to the Law of Scotland*. Second Edition. Vol. I, p. 12.
[3] Ibid., p. 13.

cised until the Commissary Court was finally suppressed in 1830. Its powers were then conveyed to the Court of Session, where they still lie.[1]

### The Doctrine of Marriage and Discipline

So much for the new administration. What of the doctrine governing these Courts and the discipline exercised? The general claim was made in this, as in other matters, that, with the Bible open before them, the Reformers made reformation. The appeal was to Scripture and only what had warrant in Scripture was to be allowed. The Reformers' work was an attempt to simplify the law, to reduce the number of marriages terminated, while providing relief in what were felt to be the most grievous cases. The chapter in the First Book of Discipline dealing with marriage begins:

> Because that marriage, the blessed ordinance of God, in this cursed Papistry hath partly bene contemed, and partly hath become so infirmed, that the parties conjoyned could never be assured in conscience, if the Bishops and Prelates list to dissolve the same; we have thought good to show our judgments how such confusion in times comming may be avoided.[2]

The Church leaders expected the law makers in the State to follow Scripture and to ensure that civil law did not contradict divine law. "Although the reformers overturned all the Romish Consistorial Courts," writes Fraser, "yet they enacted no new Consistorial code, contenting themselves merely with declaring null all laws contrary to their religion."[3] Differences in the marriage laws of the Reformed countries can be partly explained by the degree to which the Church leaders were able to influence the State authorities. The Scottish Reformers permitted divorce for adultery, and later, after some discussion, for desertion as well, basing their action upon Matt. 5. 31–2 and on the so-called "Pauline exception"—1 Cor. 7. 15. Divorce here meant not simply separation *a mensa et thoro* but the dissolution of a marriage.

At the close of the Form of Marriage which Knox brought with him from Geneva there is this injunction:

> Give diligent ear then to the Gospel, that ye may understand how our Lord would have this holy contract kept and observed, and how sure and fast a knot it is, which may be in nowise loosed, according as we are taught in the nineteenth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel.

There is no mention here of the exceptive clause in Matt 19. 9, but in the First Book of Discipline, which has been already quoted, it is stated:

> Marriage once lawfully contracted, may not be dissolved at man's pleasure, as our master Jesus Christ doth witness, unlesse adulterie be committed; which being sufficiently proved in presence of the civil magistrate, the innocent, if they so require, ought to be pronounced free, and the offender ought to suffer death, as God hath commanded.

If, as Knox knew, it was unlikely that the death penalty would be inflicted, the offender ought to be excommunicated and reputed as

[1] Ibid., pp. 15, 16.
[2] First Book of Discipline. Chapter XIII. Of Marriage.
[3] Op. cit., p. 41.

a dead member. The innocent party was "to be at freedome". Should fruits of repentance of long time appear in the offenders, and if they earnestly desire to be reconciled with the kirk, they may be again received to the participation of the sacraments, and other benefits of the kirk; "for we would not that the kirk should hold them excommunicate whom God absolved, *that is*, the penitent". What of re-marriage of offenders?

> If any demand, whether that the offender, after reconciliation with the kirk may not marry againe? we answer that if they cannot live continently, and if the necessity be such as that they feare further offence of God, we cannot forbid them to use the remedy ordained by God. If the partie offended may be reconciled to the offender, then we judge that in noways it shall be lawfull to the offender to marry any other, except the partie that before hath been offended; and the solemnization of the latter marriage must be in the open face of the kirk like as the former, but without proclamation of banns. This do we offer as the best counsell that God giveth unto us in so doubtsome a case. . . .

The General Assembly took a stricter view. In 1566, and again in 1567, it refused to recognize the re-marriage of the guilty party, and forbade ministers to officiate at the wedding of either the adulterer or the paramour "under paine of removing from the Ministrie". By the middle of the 17th century it had become the established opinion that re-marriage was permissible only to the innocent party. This teaching was reaffirmed in the Westminster Confession, which was approved by the General Assembly of 1647 and ratified and established by Acts of Parliament 1649 and 1690. Chapter XXIV of the Westminster Confession, which is still the subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland, reads:

> Marriage is to be between one man and one woman: neither is it lawful for any man to have more than one wife, nor for any woman to have more than one husband at the same time.
>
> Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife; for the increase of mankind with a legitimate issue, and of the church with an holy seed; and for the prevention of uncleanness.
>
> It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent: yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord . . . nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage: wherein a publick and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed, and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills and discretion in their own case.

### The Form of the Marriage Ceremony

In the early period of the Reformation, Sunday was favoured as the day for the marriage ceremonies. John Knox, for example, married Margaret Stewart on Palm Sunday, 1564. "The Sunday before noon," says the First Book of Discipline, "we think most expedient for marriage, and be used no day else without the consent of the whole ministerie." That practice persisted up to the middle of the 17th century, when the contrary advice was given by the Westminster Directory of Public Worship "that it be not on the Lord's day". The Solemnization of Marriage is to begin, according to this Directory,

with prayer for a blessing, and the minister is then to declare out of the Scripture "the institution, use, and ends of marriage, with the conjugal duties which, in all faithfulnes, they are to perform each to other. . . ."

The form of the marriage vow is:

> I N. do take thee N. to be my married wife, and do, in the presence of God, and before this congregation, promise and covenant to be a loving and faithful husband unto thee, until God shall separate us by death.

The woman promises to be "a loving, faithful and obedient wife". Then without further ceremony, the giving and receiving of a ring being frowned upon as being papist and pagan, the minister in face of the congregation is to pronounce them husband and wife according to God's ordinance; and so conclude the action with prayer.

Though the 1645 Directory is one of the leading documents of the Church of Scotland, it has had, according to one of our authorities upon it, Dr Thomas Leishman, "more of official recognition than hearty conformity to it". The Cromwellian occupation bore very hard on the people of Scotland. There were many who came to look unkindly on the use of set forms and ceremonies in church, and in the 19th century it became fashionable to have weddings in houses. It is not therefore surprising to find a different tone from that of the Directory in the manual for the use of ministers issued by authority of the General Assembly at the present day. It is there pointed out that it is not necessary that the wedding ceremony should take place in a church though that is usually the most fitting place, and as to the conduct of the ceremony this, subject to direction of the Presbytery as in other matters of worship, is entirely within the control of the minister. There is no prescribed liturgy for the marriage service. "All that is absolutely essential in the service is that in the presence of witnesses the Minister puts to each of the contracting parties distinctly the question whether he and she takes the other party for wife and husband respectively and, having received these answers in the affirmative, declares them in the sight of God and of his Church to be married persons."[1]

In practice to-day most ministers of the Church of Scotland follow the form of service given in the Book of Common Order of 1940, or one of the earlier books on which the 1940 Book is based. The purpose of this book is "to express the mind of the Church with regard to its offices of worship, in orders and forms which, while not fettering individual judgment in particulars, will set the norm for the orderly and reverent conduct of the various public services in which ministers have to lead their people". According to this form, marriage was ordained for the life-long companionship, help and comfort that husband and wife ought to have for each other; for the continuance of the holy ordinance of family life, and for the welfare of human society. The man and the woman promise to be "loving, faithful and dutiful", and a ring is given and received as a sign that they take each other to love and to cherish until they are parted by death.

[1] A. P. Sym, *Marriage in Scotland*. Fifth edition. Church of Scotland Publications. P. 19.

### The Present Position regarding Divorce

The doctrine of the Westminster Confession stood until 1937. In that year the Alness Bill was introduced into the House of Lords, the object of which was to extend the grounds of divorce, and the Church made this comment in a Deliverance of the General Assembly:

> The General Assembly recognize that the Church has, ever since the Reformation, held it to be in accordance with the mind of Christ that the civil authority should be empowered to dissolve the marriage tie, the grounds on which such a course may be based having from 1573 been not only infidelity but desertion—facts which import that the union between the parties has already been destroyed.

It was reported to the Assembly of 1938 that the Alness Bill had been withdrawn, and that the grounds of divorce in the Bill substituted for it conformed to the requirements laid down by the Assembly in 1937, viz. that the facts imported that the union had already been destroyed. In 1938 this Bill, the Divorce and Nullity of Marriage (Scotland) Bill became an Act. The grounds of divorce in the Scottish Act are, broadly speaking, similar to the English Act of 1937. The present position of the Church of Scotland with regard to the re-marriage of divorced persons is, therefore, that the Church recognizes the grounds of divorce so far provided by the law of the land, and forbids re-marriage by a minister in one case, that of the defender divorced for adultery.

It has been felt for some time, however, that the distinction between guilty and innocent parties does not always correspond to the moral realities of a relationship, and that, with the passing of the new legislation in 1938, new situations will confront ministers. In consequence, the law of the Church in regard to the re-marriage of divorced persons is at present under reconsideration by a Committee of the Church, which has yet to submit a final report.

There is in these matters some division of opinion, but an indication of the mind of the Church can be found in the evidence given by the Church before the Royal Commission in 1952. The section on doctrine is concerned to recall that the area of agreement between the branches of the Christian Church is far wider and more important than the area of disagreement. The Church therefore desired to put in the forefront of its evidence that the Church of Scotland adheres and always has adhered to the common Christian doctrine of the nature of marriage based upon Holy Scripture. In the view of the Church, marriage is a Divine Institution "uniquely expressive in the providential order of God's gracious care for men, bound up with the most sacred interests of the parties of the union, their children, and society at large, demanding life-long fidelity, and calling for the most watchful care and protection by Church and State alike".

William S. Tindal.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. W. H. Blyth Martin is Vicar of St Augustine's Church, Chesterfield, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Derby.

The Rev. E. P. Field is Rector of Lyng, Norfolk.

Dr Tindal is Professor of Christian Ethics and Practical Theology at New College, Edinburgh.

---

# CORRESPONDENCE

## DEACONS

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his interesting and provocative reflexions on the symposium on the diaconate, Mr Chitty sums up my contribution as being an attempt "to reduce the diaconate, from very early times, if not from the beginning, to a mere step in the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum*". In fact, I placed the point at which the diaconate began to be a *mere* step in the *cursus honorum* in the time of Hincmar (10th century) and gave evidence that the process was not complete, in England at least, even in the time of Peter of Blois (12th century). Nor was I attempting to do violence to the evidence. I have no axe to grind in this matter. The diaconate in the Western tradition of which I was writing has been a mere step in the *cursus honorum* for several hundred years; but, on my view, it need not remain so, if competent authority decides to make a change.

In one of his footnotes Mr Chitty says: "Fr Bligh is quite wrong, at least as far as the *ethos* of the Byzantine rite is concerned, in supposing that he [the deacon] separates between them" [the priest or bishop and the people]. Surely this is a strange comment to make on an article entitled "Deacons in the Latin West since the Fourth Century" which contains not a word about the Byzantine rite!

Mr Chitty is quite correct, so far as the Byzantine rite is concerned, in saying that the deacon "binds together" priest and people; indeed, the remark can be safely extended to all rites, so far as I know—including the Mozarabic rite referred to in the offending passage of my article. There is no contradiction in holding that the deacon *both* unites *and* separates the priest and people; in order to maintain his point about the conjunctive function of deacons in the Byzantine rite, Mr Chitty does not need to refute my point about their disjunctive function in the Mozarabic. Nor can he very well deny that the Byzantine deacons do in some ways disjoin priest and people, when Fr Gillet has told us, in his most valuable contribution to the symposium, that in the Orthodox East the diaconate as a liturgical institution is not considered by everyone to be desirable, because (among other reasons) "in places where appreciation of the liturgy is growing . . . the faithful do not want a deacon to come between them and the prayers of the priest".

However, I am glad that Mr Chitty has raised this point, because it has made explicit in my mind a suspicion I have often had, that the relationship between priest–deacon–people may have been influenced by the Neoplatonic tendency to fit everything into triads of the pattern *dans recipiens et dans–recipiens non dans*, in which the function of the middle member is both to unite and to separate. Fr Gillet assures us that "the Neoplatonic speculations of the *corpus dionysiacum* had no influence on the theory or practice of the diaconate", but I wonder if he would exclude all earlier Neoplatonic influence?

To my mind, the attempt of Pseudo-Denys to force the ecclesiastical hierarchy into a Neoplatonic straight-jacket was a great mistake. I feel sure Mr Chitty would agree—though he has ventured into dangerous paths by praising the Pseudo-Denys's Neoplatonic equation of deacon: priest: bishop: : purgative: illuminative: unitive ways! If the equation is sound, the question arises whether this is a coincidence, or whether Neoplatonic influence has played some part in the distribution of functions among the three orders. It is well to be explicitly aware of the non-Christian origin of the triadic pattern and to resist its fascination—or one might end up, unwittingly of course, by making the Christian deacons conform to the pattern of the auxiliaries in Plato's ideal state—since the Platonic relationship of rulers–auxiliaries–demiurges is the prototype of the Neoplatonic triad.

As part of the evidence for deacons functioning as intermediaries, I quoted Isidore: "Non enim omnes vident alta mysteriorum, quae operiuntur a levitis, ne videant qui videre non debent"—"It is not all who see the High Mysteries; they are concealed by the levites [deacons], lest they should see who ought not to see." I take it that "those who ought not to see" are the people. If so, my loose rendering—"lest they [the people] see what they ought not to see"—has not distorted the sense in any way at all. Mr Chitty calls it an "error" and a "mistranslation" and says "the effect on the sense of the passage is considerable"—without further explanation. I can only suppose he takes "those who ought not to see" to mean pagans and unworthy Christians who may be present. Perhaps that is Isidore's meaning; but even so, the worthy Christians in the congregation are prevented from seeing the mysteries no less effectively than the unworthy ones. So the argument still holds.

I would like to add a comment on another of Mr Chitty's criticisms: "Fr Bligh's argument, that now there are plenty of priests to do the administrative work, and there is no need of deacons for it, does not face at all the possibility that these functions actually distract a priest from his real calling." In my view, the real calling of priests (*sensu specificativo*, i.e. of the *ordinati ad presbyteratum*) is to be what the bishop prays that they may be in the Roman rite of Ordination, namely assistants of the episcopal order (*sint providi cooperatores ordinis nostri*), to help the bishops in their task, which is to rule, teach and sanctify their dioceses. Accordingly, it rests with the bishops to decide, with their eyes of course upon circumstances of time and place, which tasks in particular are to be assigned to priests. I see no reason why priests should regard administrative work

assigned to them by their bishops as a distraction from their real calling. There is certainly a possibility that too many priests may spend too much time in administrative work; and reform along the lines which Mr Chitty advocates might perhaps commend itself to a bishop faced with a regrettable situation of that sort—I say "perhaps" because I have no inside experience of diocesan chancelries on which to form an opinion. But if such a reform were carried out, I should justify it theologically as an adaptation of the Church's supple and flexible organization to the needs of the time, and not as a return to a (highly controversial) historic ideal. Paradoxically, I think I could plead for a Chittian reform more effectively than its author can!

Finally, may I thank you, Sir, for your kind hospitality in inviting me to participate in this instructive symposium amidst such distinguished company. When I first read Mr Chitty's letter, I exclaimed: "Alas! alas! My slip is showing!" But careful scrutiny has convinced me that it isn't really.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN BLIGH, S.J.

ST ALOYSIUS',
25 WOODSTOCK ROAD,
OXFORD.

---

## THE BAPTISMAL INTERROGATIONS

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Everyone who has to administer Holy Baptism will support Mr Whitaker's plea for clarification of the promises made by the godparents, which should certainly receive careful consideration in any future revision. I join issue with him only on an historical point: I do not think that the Puritans at the Savoy Conference can be held responsible for the addition of the words "in the name of this child" to the priest's question: "Dost thou renounce the devil . . .?"

This addition was suggested by Bishop Wren in a paper drawn up in the spring of 1660, and adopted thence, before the Conference began, in the first draft for the revision (the "Durham Book"). Wren may have had in mind the answer in the Catechism: "They did promise and vow three things *in my name* . . ." (and the 1661 revisers also added here a third question to correspond to the third "thing", and so bring the whole passage into line with the Catechism); or the service of Private Baptism, where since 1552 the question had run: "Dost thou *in the name of this child* forsake . . ." (and the revisers originally added from the same source a question before the Creed: "Dost thou in the name of this child profess this faith?" though this addition was later struck out). There is thus no need to bring the Puritans in at all; the phrase was added to secure consistency throughout the Prayer Book.

In connexion with Mr Whitaker's distinction between "in the name of" and "on behalf of", it may be noted that Jeremy Taylor, in his baptismal office for use under the Commonwealth, makes the godparents promise *on behalf of* the child that he will forsake the devil.

It may be doubted whether he intended any meaning different from that conveyed by "in the name of".

Yours sincerely,
G. J. Cuming.

The Vicarage,
Billesdon,
Leicester.
13 *March* 1956.

---

*To the Editor of* Theology.

Dear Sir,

In his excellent article in your March issue Mr Whitaker strangely ignores the most recent Baptism Office of all, that of the Church of South India. This clearly embodies his fundamental contention, though its differences are, I think, illuminating. Instead of requiring repentance and faith of the children as a hope, as Mr Whitaker suggests, it confines the renunciation to adults and makes the profession of faith the responsibility of the entire congregation. The Creed is required, not of the godparents in the name of the child, but of the Church which in the name of Christ is incorporating the child. Profession of belief is also demanded specifically of the parents and godparents (as, of course, of the candidates when adult). But that this is no "gratuitous affirmation", which "though doubtless edifying is of no significant importance", the questions that follow surely show:

> Will you endeavour to provide a Christian home for this child and so bring him up in the worship and teaching of the Church that he may come to know Christ as his saviour?
>
> *Answer:* I will, God being my helper.
>
> Will you endeavour so to order your lives that you do not cause this little one to stumble?
>
> *Answer:* I will, God being my helper.
>
> Will you encourage him later to become a full member of the Church (be confirmed); so that established in faith by the Holy Spirit he may partake of the Lord's Supper, and go forth into the world to serve God faithfully in the fellowship of his Church?
>
> *Answer:* I will, God being my helper.

In principle, surely, the faith and repentance that are the *conditions* of baptism are not the faith and repentance of the infant for which we hope, but those of the Christian family and the Christian Church which we pledge to him. It is when these are absent that infant baptism becomes indefensible. This faith is, of course, in no way a substitute for that personal faith which later is the pre-requisite of confirmation. It corresponds, rather, to that of the stretcher-bearers, of which it is written that Jesus, "seeing *their* faith, saith to the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven".

On the main issue, that the faith of the infant cannot be promised, we must agree with Mr Whitaker, and the sooner it is written out of the Anglican liturgy the better (and here the ex-Anglicans of South India have led the way). I differ from him only in questioning whether the faith or repentance of the *infant* has any place in the *Interrogations* at all. For the Interrogations set forth the pre-requisites of baptism; and of these it is not one. The place for "our hope and

prayer that the child will grow into these things" is surely where it already stands, namely in the Prayers that follow baptism.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN A. T. ROBINSON.

CLARE COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.
13 *March* 1956.

---

## A NON-PROFESSIONAL MINISTRY

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

One question which does not appear to have been given much consideration is that of the relation between the priesthood and the other occupation of the non-professional priest. In the February issue one letter speaks of a "part-time priest" (p. 75) and another tells us that it would be wrong to think of the priesthood in this way (pp. 69 f.). On p. 62 Thomas Arnold speaks of the other occupation as a "secular calling". I do not think that any and every form of employment which is available can be described in this way, nor that a priest ought to earn his living in an occupation which cannot be regarded as a calling.

I wonder whether the resistance to the idea of a non-professional ministry arises partly from a desire to evade the problem of making a list of legitimate or illegitimate occupations. Facing the problem might make it easier for the Church to teach all men the importance of choosing work which is worth doing, and not merely doing the "job" well whatever it may be, and talking glibly about the "sanctity of all work".

Yours sincerely,
F. M. JONES.

39 CAERNHYWEL,
PEMBERTON,
LLANELLY, CARM.
2nd *March* 1956.

---

# BOOK REVIEWS

THE MODERN PREDICAMENT: A STUDY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By H. J. Paton. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

It may be hoped that it will not be considered an inappropriate first comment on a book of the magnitude and distinction of Professor Paton's Gifford Lectures to say that the author has put teachers of the philosophy of religion in his debt by providing them with an admirable and comprehensive treatment of the subject to put into the hands of their pupils. Nothing so suitable for this purpose by a British author has appeared since Galloway's *Philosophy of Religion*, published before the first world war and now in many respects out-of-date. Professor Paton's book is the more suitable for the purpose because, being Gifford Lectures, it was not prepared with that end in view. The best introduction to the subject for the student who comes newly to it is not to work through a class text-book but

rather to keep company with a front-rank mind as it takes up the main topics and discusses them in the way in which Professor Paton, it is superfluous to say, does discuss them—clearly, dispassionately and with expert thoroughness and sureness of touch. There is perhaps little that is intrinsically new in Professor Paton's treatment of the problems, but that no doubt is because he sets himself, as other Gifford lecturers have not always done, to fulfil the requirements of the Gifford Trust that the lectures should be addressed to educated men and women who are not professional philosophers. Yet even the experts will find here a refreshing newness and clarity in the manner of presentation, and will finish reading the book with the sense of having spent some very pleasing and profitable hours.

Professor Paton uses the phrase of his title—"The Modern Predicament"—to indicate the seemingly unbridgable gulf between science and religion with which men are confronted to-day. This, however, need not necessarily constitute a serious predicament, or at any rate it need only be a temporary one, for there is *prima facie* a simple way out of it, which is to surrender religion. It is certainly not possible for modern man to surrender science. But in fact to sweep away religion once and for all is what few, if any, people seem able to do. They cannot get religion out of their system. In other words, the tension between science and religion is misconceived if it is thought of as being merely on the plane of ideas; rather it is a manifestation of a deep and abiding division in the soul of man, as he confronts his world, which can be traced throughout his history—the division and conflict between "mind and heart", "reason and faith", "the inner felt and the outer known"—however it may be named. Here certainly is a predicament in the fullest sense of that perhaps to-day somewhat overworked term.

To say this is but to repeat what Professor Paton himself says in the opening paragraphs of his last chapter, wherein he speaks of the division between mind and heart as a permanent human predicament of which the tension between science and religion is but one form, though for many to-day a peculiarly acute form. He does not, however, explore this more basic and inclusive cleavage in the human spirit. For this he is hardly to be criticized, for a writer must be free to choose his own course in a field so vast; yet one could not help wondering at times as one read Professor Paton's serene pages whether he was attaching enough significance to the cleavage, and whether the absence of any exploration of it in its full poignancy might not be considered something of an omission from a philosophy of religion for to-day, or indeed for any day. One's feeling on this score gained reinforcement from the one passage where Professor Paton departs from his usual calm and urbane temper and makes a rather splenetic attack on Kierkegaard. This reviewer is by no means an enthusiastic admirer of Kierkegaard, but surely the latter should not be quite so summarily dismissed as Professor Paton dismisses him on p. 120. A similar comment might perhaps be made on Professor Paton's omission of any reference, except a passing one, to the contemporary existentialist movement, which surely has some-

thing to say to us about the human predicament even though we may think that it contributes little to the overcoming of it.

The same point is perhaps indirectly illustrated by Professor Paton's description and analysis of religious experience. This is in many ways admirable, though some may think that it leans a little too heavily at this time of day on Otto's "The Holy"; but there is absent from it any consideration of the ideas of "redemption" and "sin". These ideas, in whatever form expressed, are surely highly characteristic of the religious consciousness in most, if not all, of its manifestations. Oman says roundly and rightly that "all religions are religions of redemption". The religious history of mankind is certainly fraught with agony and struggle, with a sense of anxiety and failure and of a deep division in the self, with moments of despair and darkness as well as moments of vision and ecstasy. In view of this, Professor Paton's summarizing description of religion on p. 72 as man's quest for "a life of worship, obedience and trust, not for the sake of his own wholeness, but as his contribution to an all-comprehensive whole beyond himself", whilst not untrue to the facts, leaves a good deal unsaid. In his chapter on "Religious Aberration" Professor Paton writes: "a more genuinely religious perversion is the obsession with fear and trembling, anxiety and despair"; rather oddly, he calls this perversion "primitive and well as neurotic". It is doubtful whether the familiar Kierkegaardian terms can properly be read back into even the darker elements of primitive religion, but, apart from that, a perversion is, as Professor Paton's own words indicate, a perversion of something genuine; yet this genuine element does not find place in his analysis of religion. Professor Paton does indeed mention on p. 220 the element of tragedy and bafflement in religion as well as "darker thoughts of sin", but this is not elsewhere developed.

On Professor Paton's discharge of the main task he sets himself little need be said except by way of appreciation. His broad purpose is to examine man's experience and knowledge, particularly in the spheres of science and morality, more especially in the former of these, to see whether a reflective modern man, in spite of all that is sometimes asserted to the contrary, may cultivate his religion with a sense of unimpaired intellectual integrity. There are inevitably some points in the argument to which one might demur; but the main course of it is persuasive. None of the arguments for belief in God (including the familiar triad of the ontological, cosmological and teleological arguments) are left unexamined and unillumined, and none of the problems and difficulties which challenge religious belief, particularly in its theistic form, are burked or minimized; they are all discussed and assessed with the dispassionate thoroughness which befits the expert philosopher of religion. The upshot of the argument is that there is nothing either in the nature or in the conclusions of the scientific enterprise which properly excludes religious faith. This might seem to some a disappointingly negative conclusion, but much is said in the course of the argument which is a positive contribution to a religious interpretation of the

world, much also that is a valuable corrective to religious assertions, so often made, which are shallow and glib and not honest with the facts.

H. H. FARMER.

CAMBRIDGE.

---

POUR UNE THÉOLOGIE DU TRAVAIL. By M. D. Chenu. Collections "Esprit" aux Editions du Seuil. Fr. 330.

At one stage or another the Christian is apt to notice that what he does when he is engaged in what he calls his work affects what he is able to bring to his worship. Obviously this is a matter about which the layman will want to talk with the theologian, the specialist whose job it is to study and correlate all the evidence about God's contacts with man. In the past such talks resulted in the emergence during the 13th century of a body of teaching about man's work in the world which made sense when related to the social life of the times and tied up with what the Church was saying about religious observance. And in so far as some of our work processes remain to-day substantially the same as they were in the middle ages, that teaching about man's work can still be seen to be valid. But the traditions which linger in much of the work of the housewife and the individual craftsman are by no means characteristic of those to which our industrial system pays respect, and to-day the intelligent Christian machine minder, technocrat or scientist, who approaches his priest for guidance about his personal work problem more often than not is received with a gaucheness which resembles that of the prude towards sex. Confronted with the genuine promptings of modern technical man to exercise his new-found power over the natural creation, the catholic theologian must fall back upon some sort of belief in *Laborare est orare*. But, generally, his ignorance of the new forces and stresses which the atomic scientist has let loose in industry prevents him from experiencing and taking upon himself the "uncanny" temptations and aspirations which our new power and knowledge have brought in their train. The theologian thus ill-equipped can only express his very justifiable fear of what will happen if man in his pride uses all his new energy and skill to gratify purely human desires. And fear, by itself, is always a very bad counsellor! Père Chenu's book is to be welcomed because, at any rate, he has seen into the heart of the existing situation and dared to recognize a divine purpose in what many Christians regard as a veritable devil's cauldron. He is asking the right questions about mechanization and with rare courage. In this he is of course in line with his fellow churchman Mounier, whose "Be not afraid" first introduced the thought of the Esprit movement to English readers.

That subordination of the worker to the work, involving a forgetfulness of self in pursuit of the product, which was at the heart of all St Thomas's teaching about work, is boldly accepted by Chenu as being applicable in full to the collective machine work of our age. He can still write: "The worker works for the work rather than for himself." "In the continual interplay between the perfecting of the

work and the perfecting of the worker, it is the perfecting of the work which comes first." If it is objected that much of the work exacted by our modern industrial set-up cannot be seen as offering a very promising discipline for the perfecting of the worker, if it is suggested that the product itself is now being subordinated to a mere abstraction—a false necessity that machinery must always be kept running whether we want its product or no—Chenu would reply that our subjective pretensions and preferences have been brought prematurely into play and that in consequence we have perverted both the economy and the product.

Instead of hugging our good intentions, our business is to realize that our technical revolution is supplying a new dimension to humanity and that this "new phase" is part of the divine plan. The "civilization of work" which the logic of the machine is impelling us to usher in is to be valued for its own sake. Here then is a mystique of the Machine comparable with that which has so signally served the Marxist rulers of Soviet Russia. But it is not Marxist. In one sense it may be considered to be Marxism's most formidable enemy, for what Chenu is seeking after is what Marxism may by transcendence become.

> The true and only victory over Marxism will come from the correct understanding of this function of work in the joining of matter and spirit, in the humanisation of man as in the quality of civilisation, and this finally in the individual and collective incarnation of Christian grace.

That Chenu does not claim to have given us a complete theology of work is acknowledged by the title he has chosen for this small book of 123 pages. But, most certainly, he has made a very powerful plea for one. With true Gallic panache, if not always with traditional Gallic clarity, he has hurled a powerful pot of ideas at us; and these ideas ought either to be accepted and developed, or challenged and refuted. The book should be translated into English and if possible published with notes and commentaries relating its thought to that associated with the work of our own "Frontier Council" and "Christendom" groups. We may dispute between ourselves whether there is a theology upon which a comprehensive sociology can be based, but we are likely to join forces in asking certain questions which Chenu's impetuosity has perhaps led him to overlook. How, for example, assuming that we really do believe that there is an interior law, immanent in the work itself, do we know that we really have apprehended that law? Might we not be being fobbed off with a clever imitation of it which the Devil has subtly provided for our use? Chenu apparently would have us plunge in, knowing that the wheat will be sorted from the tares in God's good time. There are of course occasions when we must all be prepared to go gaily in the dark, but at the moment, on this side of the Channel, that human reason about which Chenu writes so well seems to be prompting us to go more cautiously, for as yet we can hardly discern any image at all of the thing which God wants our machine age to become. And there still appears to be time for further reflection. Is that the difference between the English situation and the French? We can still ask

this question, though perhaps with less assurance than we could before reading this latest broadside from Esprit.

Welwyn Garden City. T. M. Heron.

---

Travaux liturgiques—I, Doctrine. By Dom Bernard Capelle. Abbaye du Mont-César (Louvain). N.p.

This is the first of two volumes which are being published to celebrate three anniversaries in the life of the veteran Abbot of Mont-César: the seventieth anniversary of his birth, the twenty-fifth of his abbatiate, and the fiftieth of his priesthood. All readers of Theology will join with the reviewer in praying that Dom Capelle may long be spared to rule his monastery and to instruct us all with his writings.

The volumes contain, not the contributions of other scholars, but the writings of Dom Capelle himself. This is particularly fortunate for us in England, for most of his non-technical writings on Liturgy have appeared in periodicals that are hard to come by in this country. The time will come when librarians will realize that a file of *Questions liturgiques et paroissiales* is essential to the study of European history in the first half of the twentieth century; but they have not done so yet. The result is that English churchmen who interest themselves in the liturgical movement are far more aware of the ecclesiology of the movement than of its spirituality. If this book has the wide sale in this country that it deserves, the balance will be on the way to being set right. It is particularly happy that this should be through the writings of Dom Capelle, for it is at present only by his technical and learned writings that he is known in this country. The present volume shows the analyst of Sarapion's anaphora and the illuminator of "Dêr Balyzeh" applying his learning to the practical business of helping people to be sound and living members of the Body of Christ.

The papers are divided into three sections: The Corporate Worship of the Mystical Body, Sacramental Worship, and a commentary upon the Sunday collects. Of the twenty-five papers in the first two sections, five are reprinted from QLP, four from the proceedings of various *semaines liturgiques*, and six are *conférences*, some of which seem to be here printed for the first time. They range from a discussion of *Mediator Dei* to the place of music in the liturgy; and they are particularly rich in expositions of the place of the liturgy in the life and devotion of various classes of Christians. Throughout, they are practical rather than academic theology, and bridge the gap between the study and the altar. The third part of the book, the commentary upon the collects, is brief (having first appeared in serial form in QLP). For the Anglican reader it is less necessary than the rest of the book; for we have the excellent work of Dean Goulburn, whose commentary is longer and sometimes deals with points for which Dom Capelle had not space. Some, however, will be interested in the Abbot's French version of the collects, which demonstrate the problems facing the advocates of a vernacular liturgy in French-speaking countries.

The papers in the first two parts of the book will not all command the approval of every reader of THEOLOGY; but even those most likely to arouse objections, such as *L'hiérarchie des actes liturgiques*, will be read with as much profit by those who disagree with them as by those who approve. And those who deal with such subjects as the Family and the Liturgy or the spiritual life of the Christian teacher will be found valuable by Christians of any doctrinal tradition.

Finally, it should be said that those who are shy of attempting to read books in French will find the Abbot's style lucid and readily intelligible, even if (like the reviewer) they never advanced beyond the Fifth Form in this subject. The second volume, containing the Abbot's historical writings, will be eagerly awaited by those who have hitherto had to quarry for them in files of periodicals.

EAST MALLING. BERNARD WIGAN.

---

CARDINAL ROBERT PULLEN: AN ENGLISH THEOLOGIAN OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY. By F. Courtney, S.J. Analecta Gregoriana LXIV. Gregorian University, Rome. N.p.

Robert Pullen was an English scholar, probably born and educated in the west country, for Fr Courtney shows that he had a cousin and other relatives at Sherborne Abbey, until he went to study at Paris. In 1133 he was back in England, lecturing on the Bible at Oxford (rather than, as R. L. Poole suggested, at Exeter). By 1142 he was teaching logic and theology in Paris where he had John of Salisbury as a pupil. Meanwhile he had been appointed archdeacon of Rochester by the administrator of the diocese, John, Bishop of Séez. His non-residence and other matters brought him into conflict with the new bishop, Ascelin, formerly prior of Dover, and the case was eventually referred to Rome, where Pope Celestine II gave his decision in the bishop's favour. This may in part have been a result of Celestine's dislike for his teaching, since the pope was known to favour Abailard, whereas Pullen was warmly supported by St Bernard, who had indeed written to Bishop Ascelin explaining that Pullen was detained at Paris "on account of the wholesome doctrine that is in him". This was, however, a temporary setback, as Pullen was summoned to Rome by the new pope, Lucius II, and became cardinal priest and papal chancellor. He did not live long to enjoy these dignities, dying some time between September and December 1146. It is evident that he was a capable administrator and ecclesiastical statesman as well as a scholar. Gilbert Foliot indeed asserted, what Fr Courtney does not tell us, that Pullen may have been largely responsible for restoring the dignity and primacy of Canterbury under Archbishop Theobald. The information, however, at the historian's disposal is too meagre to do more than to indicate vaguely why Pullen was important and to sustain John of Salisbury's verdict that he was a man "whom his life and learning alike commended".

It is with his learning that Fr Courtney is principally concerned in this thorough and careful study. Pullen's theological position is indicated by his friendship with St Bernard, who described his teaching

as "sane", and by his indebtedness to the school of Anselm of Laon. Closely acquainted with the theological writings of his own time, he did not hesitate to defend what he construed to be the orthodox position; in his discussion of the Trinity he combated the errors of Gilbert "the Universal", Walter of Mortagne and probably Gilbert de la Porrée. He also criticized the latter's theory of human nature. While he may on occasions display considerable speculative power and some originality in points of detail, as in his discussion relating to creation and the unity of God, Pullen was not an original thinker. He was essentially a conservative in his approach, saturated in St Augustine's works and the patristic writings. But his theological writing was nonetheless notable for its lucidity and the dialectical technique which he employed. His influence, except possibly for his teaching on penance, was slight. His *Sentences* were soon superseded by those of Peter the Lombard, though the latter owed him a little debt. Yet though there is nothing either very remarkable or exciting about his theological ideas, his views provide an excellent impression of the more conservative teaching of men of his own day. In content and method he may, as Fr Courtney observes, "certainly be reckoned among those who contributed to the development of the scholastic method in theology".

Fr Courtney has performed a useful task in making available so detailed and well-informed a study of Pullen's theology. The book is printed at Rome, which may account for the very large number of misprints which form an irritating feature of an otherwise excellent study.

V. H. H. Green.
Lincoln College,
Oxford.

---

The Bible Story. By Guy Daniel. Grosvenor Press. 25s.

Anybody who suffers from blood pressure and a dislike of liberal theology is strongly advised to avoid this confident and sumptuous volume. Its first section, for example, "retells *The Bible Story* in the light of modern knowledge about the gradual development of a religious sense among the Jews". This last, revealing phrase at once suggests that "*modern* knowledge" probably means what was being taught in universities and colleges twenty-five years ago and still survives in a great number of class-rooms and school text-books. Nearly every page of the book confirms this initial suspicion.

The first two (and most dubious) members of the blessed quartet JEDP are given strange and unnecessary prominence, and a quaintly faded sketch of synoptic criticism leads to the conclusion that Mark is the most important of "the four biographies of Jesus". This gospel is, the author reiterates, "a genuine biography". The systematic rationalizing of miracles and a very emphatic discussion of the Virgin Birth follow the usual form. The explicit acknowledgment of the inspiration provided by Middleton Murry's *Life of Jesus* (1926) comes as no surprise. What is surprising (and rather shocking) is the acceptance of views which the great liberal scholars had finally exploded

long before the author learned to read (e.g. the A.V.'s interpretation of Daniel 7. 13).

Although it is only too easy to be acid about this curious production, it cannot be denied that Mr Daniel shares to the full the old school's passion for explanation—a positive virtue too little recognized by those moderns who love darkness rather than the light and for whom all explaining smacks of explaining *away*. It is no good moaning about the ecstatic reception given to this book in a woman's monthly magazine, as glossy as itself, unless we have something better to put in its place. The Bible Story cannot be clothed in the rags and tatters of academic debate, and there are still too few books which enable the non-fundamentalist layman to make sense of the bits and pieces exported by our universities. That is why Mr Daniel's vigorous paraphrase of St Mark's gospel may well be taken more seriously than it deserves, even by those who buy the book mainly for its 48 coloured plates. These attractive reproductions of Giotto and the painters of the 15th and 16th centuries are, it is almost superfluous to say, in no sense direct illustrations of the text. "That," the author emphasizes, "would not be possible. The text endeavours to retell the Bible story in the light of modern critical research. The pictures date from the time when the Bible was taken as literal truth." This time was also a period when (as now) the mythology of the Bible was thought to have theological significance. Because Mr Daniel's approach is no longer modern, it shows scant appreciation of the thought-forms of the past. Its theological poverty may well drive some of his readers towards the outlook of the painters and even give impetus to the very fundamentalism he so rightly repudiates.

SALISBURY. E. W. HEATON.

---

WHAT IS MAN? A Christian assessment of the powers and functions of human personality. By J. Stafford Wright. Paternoster Press. 10s. 6d.

Readers of books by learned fundamentalists should first inoculate themselves with the article on "The Inspiration of the Bible" (C. F. Evans) in the January number of THEOLOGY. This book under review can then be read without ill effects; and it is well worth reading. Written as a whole with a notable breadth of view, the tone becomes constricted and rigid only when the authority of Scripture is mentioned. Two reservations, then, to clear the air: (1) The Christian God is no dictator either of men or manuscripts. Authoritarianism is equally abhorrent to God, whatever hat it happens to be wearing. God does not "quietly overrule" (p. 171) wise men, prophets or evangelists in order to be sure that they make no mistakes in the writing of Scripture. Despotism is no less despotic for working quietly. (2) The Word of God has only once been incarnate, in Christ. In him alone is perfection. Our Bible witnesses to Christ, interprets Christ and is interpreted through him who is alone *the Word of God*. But we are neither Jews nor Moslems, to each of whom their "book" is a kind of verbal incarnation.

*What is Man?* can, none the less, be warmly recommended as a survey, economical in words and charitable in its approach, of a number of thought systems which have captured modern imagination. Many of these Mr Wright shows to be one-sided and incomplete, some to be partial truths useful for Christians once their balance has been restored.

Chapters IV and V deal with researches into and experiments with *ESP* and *PK*, of which the best known are those of Dr Rhine ("The Reach of Mind"); but Mr Wright does not emphasize the most suggestive point for Christians, that the very testmaking seemed to defeat itself. Like Dr C. S. Lewis's "joy", the sixth sense cannot be experienced and contemplated at the same time. Science demands a dispassionate approach; but this numbs that extra sense which is religious in its nature: and intensity or effort make things worse.

Chapters VIII to XII, on miracles, occultism, spiritualism, ghosts, angels and demons, are first rate. He might have recommended (under Chapter XII) C. G. Jung's *Essays on Contemporary Events*. One feels sympathy with Mr Wright's impatience with Bible commentators who date scriptural predictions always after the events they predict—especially where the gospels are concerned: but the deutero-Isaiah is not a good text to argue from; there are more important reasons than its "predictions" for placing it late. It is reasonable to ask also whether the assumption of Elijah need be an article of faith (*vice* the Blessed Virgin (pp. 21 and 141)).

On p. 130, surely Gen. 6. 1–4 represents the unauthorized descent of spirit into matter, as compared with the deliberate rejection of God in the first Fall: in the tradition of the early Church the fallen angels are imprisoned, but the demons were the result of their trespass (Justin, Tertullian, Lactantius and others).

Where the Communion is mentioned, interpretation is one-sided (e.g. p. 154 and p. 166—"without faith the bread and wine are no more than bread or wine", cf. 1 Cor. 11. 29).

A very few misprints: "now" for "nor" on p. 116, "alleged" for "allowed" on p. 118, and a page reference number left out on that same page.

The last chapter of the book is beyond reproach.

H. A. Blair.
Southbroom,
Devizes.

---

The Planting of Christianity in Africa. Vol. III. 1878 to 1914. By C. P. Groves. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

In this volume Professor Groves reaches at last the crucial period of his grand theme. Already tropical Africa has been laid open by the explorers; it has been precariously occupied at a few strategic points by the pioneers of the missionary enterprise; it is on the brink of partition by the Powers of Europe. Now comes the great deployment. Just as the missionary has played an inevitable part in stimulating the secular enterprise, so now the secular activity discovers fresh springs of missionary energy. The human and material re-

sources of the Christian Mission in Africa are vastly augmented. The environment in which it has to operate is immeasurably more favourable. There is stable government. There are modern means of communication. There are native populations, not yet resentful of alien domination, and eager to learn the secrets of the white man's superior power. It is the Gospel's opportuunity, and the story of its seizing must surely be one of the greatest chapters in Christian history.

It is therefore the more disappointing to find that in this section of his work the author has not proved equal to the growing complexity of his material. He opens with a brief study of the territorial scramble, indifferently planned and clumsily executed. "With whatever merits and defects, three such Royal Charters were granted in the eighties after Berlin, for the three areas already indicated as of especial concern." This is one sentence which should never have been published, and there are unfortunately many more. There are also historical judgments—such as that on the Imperial British East Africa Company on page 29—which are based on a failure to discern the partiality of contemporary published sources, and which cannot be sustained in the light of modern knowledge. But the most serious criticism which must be made against this volume is the altogether disproportionate amount of space devoted to the tedious details of the expansion of individual missionary societies from one remote place to another. In the period covered by the second volume, missionary activity was still sufficiently limited to be susceptible of such treatment, the adoption of which provided also the opportunity to paint in, once and for all, the essentials of the geographical background. But during the period from the partition of Africa to the Great War, Christian agencies were so numerous that individual treatment is only achieved at the expense of any attempt to make intelligible the really significant processes of the Christian expansions. It imposes the adoption of regional divisions instead of chronological ones. It exalts the superficial details of the European approach over the vital problems of the African response.

Having used two-thirds of his space in introducing the 106 societies which were at work by 1890, and finding that there remain 116 more which entered between then and 1914, Professor Groves at last recognizes that "it is no longer possible, nor indeed desirable, to follow the individual fortunes of the separate missions, and the student must now be referred to their individual histories for such development. The peculiar circumstances in each case, that made earlier entries significant for record, have now yielded to so much of a common pattern that it is only necessary from this point to give attention to broad developments affecting the swelling stream of missionary activity, with such references to individual missions as the situation appears to demand." But the admission comes too late for the change of plan to be effective. Of the ninety pages which remain, Groves can spare just six for a discussion on the place of education in evangelism, and one more for the impact of Christian morality on African tribal customs. For the rest he is necessarily concerned with further examples of missionary deployment, with the Boer War and

native rebellions, with prohibited areas and Congo scandals, with firearms and liquor, with the Edinburgh Conference and Mission Comity.

There is one further defect in this book which is no fault of the author's. The type is so underleaded and so poorly inked that the sight does not travel easily across the page without slipping from one line to another. It should in no circumstances be read at a sitting.

LONDON. ROLAND OLIVER.

---

## SHORTER NOTICES

BROTHER EDWARD: PRIEST AND EVANGELIST. By Kenneth Packard. Geoffrey Bles. 12s. 6d.

In his foreword Lord Elton writes of the "overpowering aura of holiness" surrounding the subject of this biography. It may be that some degree of mystery must always go along with holiness as it certainly did in the case of Brother Edward.

Study the frontispiece: your inevitable comment will begin to explain that mystery. Of *this* man you can believe that he was accustomed to write his letters kneeling. Of *this* man you can allow that he was justified in refusing the third vow of the "Religious" (that of obedience) while he took the other two, for fear he should lose direct divine guidance by accepting the direction of a superior. Of *this* man you can believe much that you would question if it were attributed to other good men.

The task of describing so unusual a person must present unusual difficulties, and Mr Packard is to be congratulated on the measure of success he has achieved.

You may not expect to find wit and wisdom in Brother Edward, but you will if you read this book. When he leaves the Cowley Fathers he marvels at their kindness to "a cow with a crumpled horn". Of enforced inactivity during illness he writes "a top is not at the highest pitch of motion when it is describing its widest circles, but when you can hardly tell it is not stuck upright in the ground". Our Lord in prayer constantly looked up to heaven: "Very few English people do, I fancy; we pray down our sleeves a great deal, as if they were telephones." In answer to anxious questions about financing mission work he would say: "God has plenty of money."

One memorial he has left behind is the loose-knit company of Village Evangelists which he and Bishop Walter Carey together founded soon after the war. However much we hope and expect of this venture, is it not premature to bracket it with the Wesley revival as "two of the most powerful spiritual movements of recent centuries"?

I have no other criticism to make of an astonishing life story.

ERIC HAMILTON: BISHOP.

THE DEANERY,
WINDSOR CASTLE.

Robert Holgate, Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North. By A. G. Dickens. St Anthony's Hall Publications No. 8. 2s. 6d.

One who is at the centre of controversy all his lifetime cannot expect to escape it after his death. Three schools, liberal in their concept of learning as in their endowment, a hospital, and benefactions to colleges and inns of court, have not sufficed to save the name of Holgate from obloquy, from his day to our own. The verdicts of history are not bought by bribes. The year of the fourth centenary of his death is, therefore, opportune for a new attempt to do him justice—not simply for sentiment's sake, but because the state of Europe has taught us now to look with more sympathy and understanding at the plight of a statesman-bishop caught up in the throes of a totalitarian revolution. Holgate is not to be judged from the comfort of a deep leather chair, but from the chill of a contemporary political prison.

So Professor Dickens comes justly before us as an apologist for the monk, the bishop, the president, the archbishop; for the marriage, and even, after a personal conversion, for the *Apology* itself, that cry of a broken man from the Tower. This is not, however, a pamphlet of adulation but of critical appraisal. The devil has not become a god; historians are warned to watch the heroic assumptions which may underlie their judgments.

Windsor. G. R. Dunstan.

---

The Biblical Doctrine of Justice and Law. By H. H. Schrey, H. H. Walz and W. A. Whitehouse. Ecumenical Biblical Studies, No. 3. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

Caesar—The Beloved Enemy. By M. A. C. Warren. S.C.M. Press. 4s.

The Evangelical Doctrine of Law. By E. F. Kevan. Tyndale Press. 1s. 6d.

The first book is an adaptation by the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse of a largely continental discussion. It contains a difficult and obscure introduction by Dr H. H. Walz on justice and the law. A distinction is drawn between law as administration; real law; and justice. About justice it is rightly said, "Whatever our definition of justice may be it should at least safeguard its real distinction from law and also its necessary connection with law." But the author adds, "To call justice 'the idea of law' falls under these conditions, and with that we shall be content." The reviewer, unhappily, is not content, and neither justice nor law are clarified for him in these difficult pages. The crisis in law (more acute on the Continent than here) is linked with metaphysical uncertainty about the nature of man, and the complex nature of the problem indicated. But the fundamental issue remains obscure.

The last section of the introduction is a survey of recent ecumenical discussion which is interesting and readable, and may be linked with

Part Three, "From the Bible to Systematic Theology", which is a brief survey of Christian thought on law and justice down the centuries, and the report of the Treysa conference of 1950, which is a general survey of the issues. This material really is the introduction to the book, and should probably be read first.

The largest section of the book is a biblical study in two parts—the Bible and the righteousness of God, and the Bible and human justice. This is a very valuable study which should not be missed. As a sustained exposition of the righteousness of God it is at all points searching and stimulating. It may, however, be commented that "law", particularly in its meaning for the Old Testament, does not receive adequate treatment (e.g. what does "law" mean if Deut. 12–26 is law?). Here the lecture by the Principal of the London Bible College on the "evangelical" doctrine of law, though conceived too narrowly both legally and theologically, does us real service in raising some fundamental issues. It is also evident that the probing of the question of the authority of the biblical revelation, the reconciliation between what is true and "the biblical point of view", has not come to rest. In places the treatment seems almost biblicist (e.g. p. 135. "that 'law of God' is not known to them except indirectly, through their knowledge of the people of God who bear witness to it", and in the use of some passages from the Bible), at other places it is clearly not so (p. 76, Old Testament laws do not apply to every community; p. 154, law and justice cannot be regarded with the eschatological indifference of the New Testament).

All in all the volume is a valuable contribution to a continuing enterprise of great difficulty, and if it is more successful biblically than as an illumination of the problems of justice and law, that perhaps was to be expected.

Canon Warren's readable and very racy Reinecker lectures are valuable studies in the changing relation between church and state. He successfully contends for a theology of imperialism and vindicates the difficult and important place of the Western missionary in an Asia and Africa in revolt against the West. His least successful lecture, on the function of the Church in the social service state, seems to the reviewer much the most significant. Canon Warren believes that the Church has to worship God and bear witness to his sovereignty; to demonstrate *agape* towards men and thus to prepare the State for its place in the purposes of God. But, we may ask, how does the Church demonstrate *agape* in the social service state? In raising this question Canon Warren has done us great service. It is to be hoped that he may put us even more in his debt by giving us an extended answer.

BRADFORD. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

---

ST BONIFACE: A LIFE IN VERSE. By Donald Atkinson. S.P.C.K. 2s.

The narrative verse of this small book is lucid and gives an account of the saint which does justice to his importance to Europe. There is, however, little poetry; but that little is good. One wishes the author

had made more of the occasional illuminating shafts from Scripture, which give depth to the picture.

IN THE BEGINNING: THE STORY OF CREATION. By Roger Pilkington. Independent Press. Boards, 5s.; limp, 4s.

The author tells for young people the story of the origins of the world according to our science. With this he contrasts the guessing of the ancient world's cosmology. As he is concerned that Genesis should not wholly be discredited, he quotes it extensively—but mainly in chapter headings where the old account conveniently divides his subject. God is the Creator and his creation is good; "and if we are images of a creator, then it is up to us to create, and to create good things too. . . . We live at the end of the beginning. The world will go on into the future. . . ." That is his moral. Obviously there are limits imposed upon an author in such a book, but his presuppositions, be they humanist or Christian, necessarily colour his picture. Here is no hint of the Fall, no hint of the Incarnation, no hint of the summing-up of all things in Christ. Yet the wonder of his story leads to these things.

It might have been well to say that it is Archbishop Ussher and not the Bible that dates the Creation in 4004 B.C. There are pleasing illustrations by Piet Klaasse.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, ELY. VICTOR DE WAAL.

---

WONDERFUL ORDER. By F. C. Blomfield. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Here is a fresh approach to the problem of women and the priesthood, a topic notoriously productive of arid argument. This makes the author's achievement the more remarkable. She brings to her task a rare spiritual penetration and what is perhaps rarer still—a mature judgment. As a result the reader is left with the impression of having had something of the authentic pattern of creation unveiled before his eyes.

Mrs Blomfield starts from the conviction that sex differentiation in man is no superficial accident of physiology, but a matter of profound significance rooted in the deeper spiritual ground of gender. God himself is to be conceived as far transcending this principle; yet it is in the worship of the Trinal Unity that man is given the key to the mystery. The equality of Persons subsists in no jealously guarded status, but in the utter outpouring of charity, which is manifested to man in the humility of the Incarnation. The same pattern informs the service of the angelic hierarchy, and in particular that "wonderful order" in which the angels are united with men. Within mankind it supplies the key to the relationship of the sexes; and it should find a full and rich expression in the corporate life of the Church. Above all, it illuminates the true "liturgy" of the laity. A small book, irenical and constructive beyond its size.

HAMBRIDGE. G. F. HILDER.

HISTORY OF THE MORAVIAN CHURCH. By Edward Langton. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

THE LORD'S HORSEMAN. By Umphrey Lee. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

In 1457 "Gregory the Patriarch" and his companions, having settled at Kunwald, and taken the Archbishop of Prague's advice to choose ministers from their own number, held a conference at which "they formed a church fellowship among themselves". This is usually taken as the date of the origin of the Moravian Church. Doubtless with an eye to the fifth centenary, next year, of this event, Dr Langton offers us this short history. Himself a Methodist minister, he writes with sympathy. He points out that the Roman Church never became native in Bohemia: even two centuries after Hildebrand, at any rate in private, "the Bohemians cherished their own beliefs and practices". The notorious treatment of Huss encouraged alike Bohemian nationalism and anti-papalism. Such is the background of the early Moravian Church; it is Protestant yet pre-Reformation.

In 1522 overtures were made to Luther; though nothing came of them, the reformer was constantly pressed by the brethren to exercise a more stringent discipline. The Protestant defeat at Weissenberg all but extinguished the Moravians, but revival came in 1715 at Fulneck and Lititz, and in 1729 Herrnhut was founded under Zinzendorf's patronage, who later became Warden of the Community. By 1732 brethren were at work in the mission field (West Indies). He points out that they worked in Greenland for six years before any converts were baptized.

The Polish Branch had retained episcopal succession; this was restored in 1735 to the whole Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Potter) declared that "the Moravian brethren were an apostolic and episcopal Church", a position recognized by an Act of Parliament in 1749. As we should expect, Dr Langton dwells at some length on the relationship between Moravian and Methodist societies, pointing out mutual indebtedness as well as points of separation. But it is a pity that he passes almost in silence from the 18th to the 20th century. Surely an event such as a fifth centenary ought to call forth a more complete chronicle. He stresses the missionary (but non-proselytizing) record of the brethren: "Hassé points out that whilst in the Protestant Churches at large the proportion of missionaries is about 1 to 5,000, among the Moravians it is 1 to 60."

Some statements need justifying, such as a claim that "behind John Wesley lay . . . the reaction to the high-churchmanship of his parents". Sometimes he accepts (perhaps from his sources) a naive equation of Christian and non-Roman. There are misprints on pp. 48, 117 and 157.

The title and dust-cover of Dr Lee's book are misleading, suggesting a book on Wesley's itinerancy. It is simply another brief life. It is original only in two ways: the author, in contrast to so many, "plays down" the influences upon Wesley, such as his mother, the Moravians, and Law; and he has his own ideas to account for "the causes which within a few days' time changed John Wesley from a defender

of the American cause to a determined opponent". Otherwise it is a pleasant enough Life, enthusiastically written, with pithy comments. The sketch is of the man who tried to make the rules of an Oxford Holy Club serve throughout the world which he had taken for his parish.

BRAMPTON. KENNETH HARPER.

---

THE ANCRENE RIWLE. Rendered into Modern English and edited by M. B. Salu. Burns and Oates. 15s.

In the early 13th century some anonymous cleric prepared for three ladies this vernacular guide to the life of an anchoress. His counsel, now thanks to Miss Salu available to the least scholarly, is always interesting, often piquant, and occasionally suggestive.

Its readability springs from a concern for detail, and a power of homely illustration, giving glimpses of the daily routine in the "household"; also from a style robust and clear, direct yet exuberant with metaphor. "Has the cat of hell ever snatched at her and caught with its claws the head, as it were, of her heart?" Miss Salu keeps as near as possible to the original without being over-quaint. "Strike upon the sense of your hearts" may be rather a tame rendering of "leap into your heart's nose", but the literal version is supplied in a footnote! Of these we have just enough; like Dom Gerard Sitwell's Introduction, they are wholly admirable.

Our 14th-century mystics are rightly familiar. The "Riwle" is less heady stuff, and less concerned with the heights of contemplation than with the avoidance of sin—particularly unchastity. It is, just the same, something not to be passed by when the general reader gets such a unique chance of savouring it as Miss Salu affords. But, unless you are a specialist, skip the chapter on "Devotions"!

HULL. D. W. FOSTER.

---

# BOOKS RECEIVED

*(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. K. Ellis, *Hugh Latimer* [Seatonian Prize Poem] (1s. 6d.); W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (70s.).

COLLINS: Gerald Vann, O.P., *The Divine Pity* [Fontana Books; the original edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, May 1946, pp. 159 f.] (2s. 6d.).

CONTINUING COMMITTEE ON MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN CO-OPERATION (47 EAST 67TH STREET, NEW YORK 21): *The Proceedings of the First Muslim-Christian Convocation at Bhamdoun, Lebanon, April 22–27, 1954* ($3.50).

ÉDITIONS RENÉE LACOSTE (PARIS): Matthys Vermeulen, *L'Aventure de l'Esprit: la part de l'homme dans cette aventure* (n.p.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: G. F. Macleod, *Church Prospect* [Alex Wood Memorial Lecture] (1s. 6d.).

HARVILL PRESS: H. Urs von Balthasar, *Elizabeth of Dijon* (12s. 6d); Adrienne von Speyr, *The Handmaid of the Lord* (16s.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): *Evengelische Marienverehrung* [Eine Heilige Kirche, 1955/56 Heft I] (DM. 4.50).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON